

REMARKS

The above amendment with the following remarks is submitted to be fully responsive to the Office Action of October 3, 2007. Reconsideration of this application in light of the amendment and the allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-4, 9-12, 19-23, 29-31 and 33-60 were pending in the present application prior to the above amendment. In response to the Office Action, claims 1, 9, 19, 29, 30, 41, and 42 are amended. Claims 23, 35, and 36 are canceled. Therefore, claims 1, 3-4, 9-12, 19-23, 29-31, 33-34, and 37-60 are now pending in the present application and are believed to be in proper condition for allowance.

Referring now to the Office Action, claims 21, 22, 35, and 36 are objected to as being duplicates. By the cancellation of claims 35 and 36, Applicants believe this objection is overcome.

Claims 23, 29-30 and 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. By the cancellation of claim 23, Applicants believe this rejection is overcome. Applicants have amended claims 29 and 30 to recite "the plasma generating device", and claims 41 and 42 to recite "the plasma generating device comprises". By these claim amendments, Applicants believe these rejections are overcome.

Claims 1, 3-4, 19-23, 29-30, 33-38, 41, 43-44, 46-50 and 56-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0067400 to Kawase et al. in view of European Patent No. 1 071 117 A2 to Yamazaki and U.S. Patent No. 5,679,167 to Muehlberger.

The Examiner notes that Kawase et al. disclose ... a plasma generating device for generating a plasma and processing an object under atmospheric pressure or approximate atmospheric pressure; and an ink jet device for applying a droplet to the object.

Further, the Examiner notes that Yamazaki teaches providing a plurality of processing chambers in a single semiconductor processing apparatus for the purpose performing a multi-step processing method without the object being processed touching open air.

Further, the Examiner notes that Muehlberger disclose providing a plasma spraying device with a motion control device for the purpose of producing oscillating yaw or other

motions of the plasma spraying device, Further, the Examiner notes that although the disclosure of Muehlberger does not explicitly disclose that the motion is perpendicular to the direction in which the object is transferred in/into the chamber, the disclosure does fairly teach that specific motion of the plasma spraying device can be chosen to produce a desired pattern.

In response, Applicants note that amended independent claims 1 and 19 recite a rail for sliding a plasma generating device is provided in a first chamber for performing a plasma treatment on an object. Further, in amended independent claims 1 and 19, the plasma generating device is moved along the rail. Neither Kawase, Yamazaki, nor Muehlberger teach, disclose, or suggest sliding a plasma generating device along a rail. Therefore, the present invention as claimed in independent claims 1 and 19 is not rendered unpatentable by Kawase, Yamazaki, or Muehlberger, alone or in combination. Because claims 3-4, 20-23, 29-30, 33-38, 41, 43-44, 46-50 and 56-60 depend from independent claims 1 and 19, these claims are also not rendered unpatentable.

Claims 9-12, 31, 39-40, 42, 45 and 51-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0067400 to Kawase et al. in view of European Patent No. 1 071 117 A2 to Yamazaki.

In response, Applicants note that amended independent claim 9 recites a rail for moving a plasma generating device is provided in a first chamber for performing a plasma treatment on an object. Further, in amended independent claim 9, the plasma generating device is moved along the rail. Neither Kawase nor Yamazaki teach, disclose, or suggest sliding a plasma generating device along a rail. Therefore, the present invention as claimed in independent claim 9 is not rendered unpatentable by Kawase or Yamazaki, alone or in combination. Because claims 10-12, 31, 39-40, 42, 45 and 51-55 depend from independent claim 9, these claims are also not rendered unpatentable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. However, if any issue remains after considering this response, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned to expedite the prosecution and work out any such issue by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jessica M. Egner, Reg. No. 51,646/
Jessica M. Egner
Registration No. 51,646

NIXON PEABODY LLP
401 9th Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128
(202) 585-8000
(202) 585-8080 (Fax)
Customer No. 22204

Dated: February 4, 2008